

Subject: Revised Notes from last e-mailing

SG1I

Help! I am a victim of too quick on the UNIX mouse button and mailed you my thoughts before I proof read them. Eeeek...they were full of too fast typing mistakes and outright misspellings. I am very sorry. Please junk that last mail and use the corrected version below. [I should slow down in my typing 120 wpm is not good!!! (:-)]

Revised notes follow:

Hello. As I begin going through an extraordinary mound of material a thought occurred to me. I do not know exactly what your time constraints are, but of the amount allocated to you by the Congressional directive, you might consider contracting to us for [redacted] of it for the following 7-months work beginning ASAP. (This is NOT an formal or informal proposal--just an idea to help you with what appears to be a very difficult job.)

SG1D

SG1D

For 6-months, you and I would work closely together to 'data-reduce' the project into a manageable form for proper review by the NAS. I would suggest the following approach to spark our discussion on the 28th.

I. Applications

involves judgments which have psci

Given access to the Ft. Meade data and protocols, we would amass a 'success' book, a 'failure' book and track repeat customer hits. (Any other critical analyses *how much and if any we dealing with? Could be done in conjunction with* that we can think of would also be added.) Giving the NAS anything short of a 'reduced' data set would be impossible to interpret by any honest review scientists. All this might include positive and negative testimonials that exist. Also, we might include selected examples--I am generally not in favor of showing gee-whizz examples because they can significantly mislead,

but perhaps in this case it might be instructive to illustrate specific points.

[I define application-oriented research as that which is primarily aimed at improving the AC output. Basic research is that which is primarily aimed at understanding the mechanisms.]

II. Application-Oriented Research

We will provide a single (readable) document that describes a meta-analysis (psychology jargon for quantitative review) of all the government-sponsored research in this domain. That would include selecting receivers (i.e., human subjects), training them, assessing (analyzing) their output, and

protocol issues (e.g., what are the procedural, physical, and psychological circumstances for optimal performance.) Such an analysis would include what is "known" and why, what is suspected, and what seems not to be true. It might also include what would be done in the future, given that the program continues.

III. Basic Research ? 10E?

*still helpful to organize
into three areas, regardless*

We will provide a single document that describes a meta-analysis of all the government-sponsored basic research. That includes issues like physical parameters (e.g., grad(Shannon Entropy), brain wave activity, and information transmission characteristics). Knowns, unknowns, and future directions would also be included.

IV. A number of 5-year plans have been written. We would up-date the most recent one as a template on how to proceed, IF it is decided to do so. This also could include a list of knowns, unknowns, and speculations and their justifications. — *who wrote these?*

V. There have been a number of government-sponsored reviews of this) *other PPTs?* work. We would provide to you critical analysis of those reviews and, where appropriate, the rebuttals, and hard copy of the original pertinent publications. That would include reviews by: NRC, OTA, Army, Two OSD, and DIA.

VI. We will provide access to an august group of national/international class scientists and government representatives who would be able to provide independent views to the NAS panel.

VII. Other respected scientists have published in main-stream journals showing the results of their analysis and experiments which suggest an information-transfer-anomaly (we call Anomalous Cognition). We should

provide a review of this literature.

Cong deadline!

At the end of a 6-month period, we would have a manageable amount of material that could then be properly assessed by the NAS during the last month of the contract (i.e., through the month of September). Depending upon the output of such a critical review, your place can decide what, if anything, you might want to do in FY 1996.

SG1D

Beginning March 15 and Ending 30 September, [redacted] is required. That includes me and a technical assistant full time, part time administrative assistant, and one consultant receiver who has personal memory of the applications back to 1979. In fact he was responsible for most of the data to 1983 (or whenever he retired). It also includes travel and the usual fees and SAIC bean-counting.

We would include contributing, as required, to the NAS investigation of this material. My point is not to hide anything; rather, it is to organize a 20 year research and applications program into some manageable form. Otherwise the NAS might be on your case (:-).

Again, Andy, this is just a thought where I think we can contribute given that the timing works out. The directive as I understand it would be easily satisfied with such an approach. At the moment, I cannot think of a better way to provide an honest assessment of the \$20M-20 year program.

Let me know what you think of this idea...any of it can be changed or ignored as the case may be.

Thanks,

Ed

Edwin C. May, Ph.D.
Director, Cognitive Sciences Laboratory
Science Applications International Corporation
330 Cowper Street, Suite 200
Palo Alto, California 94301 USA

Voice: (415) 327-2007
e-mail: may@hildegard.saicmp.com